DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 381 961 EC 303 908

AUTHOR Christen, Margaret H.; Hasbrouck, Jan E.
TITLE Providing Peer Coaching in Inclusive Settings: A Tool for Consulting Teachers.
PUB DATE [Apr 95]
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual International Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children (73rd, Indianapolis, IN, April 5-9, 1995).
PUB TYPE Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Observation Techniques; *Consultation Programs; *Disabilities; *Inclusive Schools; Intermediate Grades; Junior High Schools; Mainstreaming; Middle Schools; Peer Teaching; Rating Scales; *Regular and Special Education Relationship; Self Evaluation (Individuals); Special Education Teachers; *Teacher Improvement

ABSTRACT

An observational instrument was developed to facilitate the peer coaching process by special education consulting teachers with regular class teacher colleagues. Use of the instrument was piloted by a special education consulting teacher with three middle school teachers whose classes included special education and at-risk students. The instrument was developed to guide observation of a teacher's lesson and subsequent debriefing and coaching of the teacher for improving instructional effectiveness. The three middle school teachers had experience levels of 10 years, 3 years, and 3 months, respectively. Following the observations and debriefing, teachers were encouraged to select areas for improvement and to keep a written journal tracking all efforts undertaken to meet their goals. Teachers were observed again 3 to 5 weeks later. Two of the three teachers raised their scores in the targeted areas (the third had received high scores in all areas initially) and all three responded positively to being observed and to the consultation and improvement process. (Contains 23 references.) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Running Head: PEER COACHING

ED 381 961

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Providing Peer Coaching in Inclusive Settings:

A Tool For Consulting Teachers

Margaret H. Christen, M.A.

Jan E. Hasbrouck, Ph.D.

Texas A&M University

College of Education

Department of Educational Psychology

EC 303908

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Margaret H. Christen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Abstract

Special education consulting teachers sometimes provide peer coaching to their classroom teacher colleagues: observing a lesson being taught and providing suggestions for improving instruction. An instrument was developed to facilitate this peer coaching process. This study piloted the use of this instrument by a special education consulting teacher with three middle school teachers with classes which included special education and identified at-risk students. Results showed different responses to peer coaching by teachers with different levels of experience. Suggestions for peer coaching in school settings will be discussed.

Introduction

As increasing numbers of students with special needs are included in general education classrooms, the role of special educators is changing. Special education teachers are frequently serving as consulting teachers, providing support to colleagues in general education classrooms (Idol, 1993). One way for consulting teachers to perform this role is to serve as peer coaches to classroom teachers (Simpson, Whelan, & Zabel, 1993).

Peer Coaching

In peer coaching, a teacher observes a colleague, then, based on the results of this observation, provides assistance in developing or improving instructional skills, strategies and techniques (Strother, 1989). The process has been shown to increase teachers' effectiveness by (a) reinforcing and extending positive practice, (b) extending skills and understandings, (c) remediating or developing alternatives for less effective practices, and (d) providing highly skilled teachers with newer, research-based techniques (Hunter & Russell, 1989; Miller, Harris, & Watanabe, 1991; Showers, Joyce, & Bennett 1989).

Effective coaching is guided by a clear definition of effective instruction so

a coach can (a) identify strengths and weaknesses in a lesson, and then (b) provide specific feedback and suggestions for improvement (Hunter & Russell, 1989). A reliable, valid, and easily-used instrument that clearly defines key elements in an effective lesson and provides guidelines for debriefing would facilitate peer coaching by consulting teachers. Peer coaching has potential to be an effective tool for special education teachers in their new role which often requires collaboration with general education teachers.

When teachers learn to work together collaboratively, students' prospects for success are also improved (Little, 1989). Unfortunately, collaboration between professional colleagues in schools is often impeded because of prevailing cultural expectations that teachers should independently handle all problems related to their own students (Goodlad, 1984; Little, 1982). One consequence of this culture of isolation is that teachers begin to feel that they are somehow not measuring up to their colleagues (Lieberman & Miller, 1984) and that asking for assistance or even admitting to having a problem is a sign of incompetence (Rosenholtz, 1989). With little willingness to take the risks necessary for growth, classroom procedures remain the same.

Peer coaching has been shown to facilitate the collaboration necessary for

positive change by breaking down the isolation of teachers and instilling a climate of trust and collegiality (Robbins, 1991). When collaboration is enhanced through peer coaching, the chances of achieving desired outcomes of improved teacher and student performance is improved.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the effectiveness of peer coaching by a special education consulting teacher utilizing an instrument designed to guide (a) the observation of a teacher's lesson and then (b) the debriefing and coaching of the teacher for improving instructional effectiveness.

Methodology

Description of Instrument

Based on effective school research (NWREL,1990) and a content analysis of several current teacher observation instruments, a new instrument was developed for use in the Consulting Teacher Training Program at Texas A&M University for use by peer coaches (here defined as special education consulting teachers who observe their colleagues to assist them in developing or improving instructional skills, strategies, and techniques). The Scale for Coaching Effective Instruction (SCIE) (Hasbrouck, 1994b) has thirty-three items grouped into three

categories: (a) Lesson Planning and Organization, (b) Instruction, and (c) Classroom Management. Each of the thirty-three items contains a description of specific teaching behaviors which serve as criteria to help guide consistent and accurate coding. The observed teacher's performance on each item is rated using a five-point coding scale from 1 (improvement needed) to 5 (excellent). Items can also be coded as "not applicable" or "could not judge" (see Figure 1). The SCIE assesses a teacher's performance only within the observed lesson. Other areas of concern in instruction which cannot be observed or judged within a single lesson such as previous instruction received by students, long-range goal setting and assessment, etc. are outside the scope of this instrument.

To use the SCIE, a peer coach observes a colleague's lesson for at least 40 minutes, making detailed, anecdotal notes. Immediately following the lesson, the peer coach codes the lesson using the descriptors for each of the thirty-three items of the SCIE, referring back to anecdotal notes as necessary. After coding is completed the peer coach debriefs the lesson and ratings with the teacher as soon as possible following the lesson. This debriefing serves to target low-rated areas for improvement and discuss ideas for making positive changes.

An interater reliability of .81 (.52 Kappa) (Suen & Ary, 1989) was

achieved with the SCIE by a group of six experienced teachers following five hours of training using video tapes of lessons (Hasbrouck, 1994a).

Setting

This study was conducted in three phases over a seven week period during the spring semester of the 1993-1994 school year in a suburban middle school located in West Houston. The school serves about 1100 students in grades six through eight. There is a teaching staff of 65, three of whom are consulting teachers, one at each grade level, with a fourth special educator who spends approximately one-third of her teaching time consulting with general educators.

Participants

The researcher, an experienced special educator and consulting teacher, served as the peer coach (PC) in this case study. The PC had a total of 14 years teaching experience as a special educator, the majority at the middle school level. Her experiences have included co-teaching classes and assisting general educators, e.g., providing inservice training and implementing curriculum and classroom adaptations for special education students mainstreamed into general education classes. She had been actively involved in the development of the SCIE and was considered an expert user of the instrument.

Participants were sought from among the general education teachers currently teaching in the same school as the PC. Three were chosen to participate. The three teachers had varying levels of experience, taught different subjects, and worked at different grade levels. Two of the participants were sixth grade teachers, members of a team comprised of either three or four colleagues. The third was an eighth grade teacher. All three teachers had identified special education students included in their classes. Their experience levels were as follows: ten years, three years, and three months respectively. All were selected to participate in the study because they (a) taught different content/subject areas, and (b) hoped to enhance their instructional effectiveness, particularly with their identified special education and at-risk students.

Procedures

Phase One

In the first phase of the study the PC reviewed the SCIE instrument and the procedures with each teacher individually explaining its purpose, the criteria used for each judgement, and answering any questions. The PC then used the SCIE to observe each teacher conducting two lessons of at least 40 minutes duration. These two lessons were scheduled within two or three days of each other. In

each case, both lessons were from the same content area (math, science, reading, etc.) and used similar content-delivery procedures (lecture, cooperative learning, direct instruction, etc., or similar combination of procedures).

As soon as possible following the second observation (no more than four hours later), the PC debriefed the results from the two SCIE observations with the teacher. During the debriefing the PC showed the observed teacher the results from the SCIE coding sheets for both lessons and then asked her to identify one to three of the lowest rated items to target for improvement.

Interim

During the next four to five weeks, the teachers kept a written journal tracking all efforts undertaken to meet their targeted goal(s). These efforts could have included attending relevant workshops, discussing ideas/procedures with their colleagues or the peer coach, reading professional literature, brainstorming, or simple reflecting on her own performance. Each teacher also independently completed one SCIE each week following a lesson of the same content and using similar presentation procedures as the original two lessons. The teachers rated themselves using only those SCIE items that they had targeted for improvement. Each SCIE protocol was given to the PC to ensure that each SCIE was completed

independent of previous scores.

Phase Two

The PC returned to each teacher's classroom after no less than three weeks and no more than five weeks and conducted a follow-up SCIE observation of the same teacher on a lesson from the same content area and using similar presentation procedures of the two lessons observed in Phase One. No later than four hours following this observation, the PC met with the teacher and discussed the results. Within one week of the final observation, the teachers and PC completed a questionnaire asking for their opinions regarding (a) their improvement, (b) the utility of the various interim improvement activities, and (c) the utility of the SCIE to identify instructional concerns and to assist in self-improvement (see Design 2).

Results

The SCIE has thirty-three items grouped into three categories. The observed teacher's performance on each item was rated using a five-point coding scale from 1 (improvement needed) to 5 (excellent) or were coded as "not applicable" or could not judge. After reviewing the completed SCIE, two to three items from within the same category were chosen by the observed teacher

to target for improvement. Means of these targeted items on the initial and final teacher's SCIE observations were calculated. The teachers' logs were reviewed and a list of activities undertaken to improve performance was identified. These activities were recorded by type of activity and frequency. Information gathered from the questionnaires completed at the conclusion of the study is also reported in this section.

Teacher #1: Ms. Smith

Background. Ms. Smith was a first year eighth grade math teacher with approximately three months of teaching experience. She started teaching at the start of the second school semester. Ms. Smith taught a total of six classes and all of her classes had a combination of average-achieving, identified at-risk and special education students. The class period chosen for this study was one that included at-risk and average-achieving students. This was the class with which Ms. Smith felt she could use the most assistance. During several of her other class periods the Chapter One remedial math teacher was present and co-taught with her. Ms. Smith felt comfortable with her ability to teach the math content but uneasy with her classroom management techniques. She had requested participation in the study in hopes of receiving assistance in this area.

Coaching Activities. Upon completion of the first SCIE observation the PC and Ms. Smith met and targeted three areas were for improvement, all from within the Classroom Management category. The three items were (a) management behaviors, (b) student self-monitoring and self-management, and (c) minimizing transitions and disruptions.

Based upon the PC's observations, several suggestions were made to help Ms. Smith have more in control of the class including (a) holding individual student conferences and including parents whenever possible, (b) moving around the room instead of positioning herself at the front of the room, (c) using direct positive comments aimed at both the class and individual students, and (4) making her expectations clear when cooperative activities were conducted. Ms. Smith also decided that she would meet with the Chapter One teacher to find out how to better utilize the learning lab that was available to some of her students during that class period. Ms. Smith was uncertain as to how much time the students could leave her classroom for the lab and also what were the most appropriate activities for the students.

Data Collected. Ms. Smith's initial SCIE observation had a mean score of four for the three items targeted for improvement. The mean score for these

same three targeted items was five on her final SCIE observation four weeks later.

Ms. Smith's log detailed her attempts to promote change in her classroom management procedures. A total of eight entries demonstrated self-reflection and documentation of efforts undertaken to bring about change e.g., setting up a new seating arrangement, better use of cooperative grouping, conferences with students, parents, and the Chapter One teacher, and using incentives for improving students' behavior. Ms. Smith reported that this process of self-reflection was beneficial to her as she was able to do some self-critiquing and also was able to utilize suggestions made by the PC.

After completion of the follow-up questionnaire the PC and teacher discussed the peer coaching process using the SCIE. Ms. Smith rated this process as a very positive experience. She appreciated the assistance, and expressed a desire for coaching to be continued. As a first year teacher she felt the process was helpful in building her confidence because receiving specific feedback on her teaching from an experienced colleague enhanced her teaching effectiveness. She also stated that she felt there were observable changes in her classes and hoped for continued improvement in her student's behavior. Ms.

Smith invited the PC to return to her classroom to observe these changes.

Teacher #2: Ms. Ryan

Background. Ms. Ryan was a sixth grade science teacher with three years of teaching experience. She was a member of a team of five teachers. This was her second year to be involved in a team situation and she was very supportive of this arrangement as she felt her team members (all of whom had more experience) served as mentors. Ms. Ryan was very comfortable with the course content she taught. She was serving on a district curriculum team that was in the process of standardizing the sixth grade science curriculum throughout the district. She had expressed a desire to participate in the study because she wanted assistance in tailoring her methods and materials for her special needs students. Ms. Smith felt that her special education students were not benefitting from her teaching as their performances on homework, quizzes, and tests were usually quite low. She reported that they usually participated well in class discussions and group work.

Coaching Activities. After the first SCIE observation the PC and Ms. Ryan met to choose items for improvement. The three targeted items were within the Lesson Planning and Organization category: (a) quality/match of

curriculum materials/media, (b) accurate content information, and (c) learning strategies.

Ms. Ryan was given suggestions for modifying the assignments of the special needs students. It was also suggested that she provide her special education students, and any other students who would benefit from them, with a copy of the notes of her lecture. The PC determined that one of the reasons the students' homework was of poor quality was inadequate classroom notes which were usually needed to complete the assignments. Ms. Ryan was encouraged to try giving some of her tests and quizzes orally. The PC demonstrated how to modify tests without changing the content to better meet the needs of the students.

Data Collected. A comparison of the initial and final SCIE observations on the three SCIE items targeted for improvement for Ms. Ryan yielded a 3.33 for the first observation and 3.66 for the same three items on the final observation four weeks later.

Ms. Ryan's log had a total of ten entries. These entries were anecdotal notes of discussions she held with her school peers and other education-related personnel. Seven of these discussions were with her team members and ranged from concerns about testing policies to the structure of their current advisory

period. The discussions with other professionals were related to the topics of site-based management and the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) testing program, a state mandated norm-referenced test. She also included a reference to a professional staff development workshop she had attended that provided teachers with suggestions for improving the skills of students on the up-coming TAAS test.

Upon completion of the follow-up questionnaire, Ms. Ryan reported that she welcomed the support she received from the PC, felt very comfortable with the process, and believed she had made improvements in her teaching effectiveness, even though her SCIE ratings showed minimal change. Ms. Ryan felt the SCIE item descriptors were very helpful to her in planning her lessons. She reported that after completing her lesson plans for the week she would review the SCIE items to be certain she had included all components necessary for teaching effective lessons. After teaching a lesson Ms. Ryan used the SCIE to self-critique her teaching and lesson implementation. Like Ms. Smith, Ms. Ryan also expressed a desire to continue with this collaboration at the start of the next school year.

Teacher #3: Ms. Long

Background. The third participant, Ms. Long, participated in the study but in a modified manner. She was a ten-year teaching veteran currently teaching reading to sixth graders. She had requested participation in the study because she was unable to achieve a consistent level of success with all of her classes. She had a reputation as an excellent teacher and had enjoyed a great deal of success in her teaching career. This year, Ms. Long was feeling frustrated with one of her five classes because her methods did not seem to be benefitting the students. This particular class had three identified special education students and seven identified at-risk students out of a total of 22 students. Ms. Long targeted for improvement two areas: disruptive behavior and a substantial number of students below grade level.

Coaching Activities. Although Ms. Long reported difficulties in the area of disruptive behaviors and below grade level skills, these components were not observed on the days the SCIE observations were conducted. Ms. Long and the PC felt that this might possibly be attributable to the students' sporadic attendance and the possibility that the presence of the PC made the students more aware of their behaviors and hence they demonstrated more self-control. Ms. Long kept anecdotal notes in her lesson plans and in her student grading book of

the particular problems that she was encountering. The PC arranged to meet with the teacher to discuss these areas of difficulty and to offer some suggestions and assistance. Extensive coaching was offered in the area of appropriate classroom modifications. Classroom modifications included: shortened assignments, grading based on student effort as opposed to the actual numerical grade earned, and test modifications. These modifications appeared to increase the level of success for the targeted students. Another intervention implemented was co-teaching by the PC. Suggestions were also given for behavior strategies that could be implemented by both the classroom teacher and the PC.

As a result of implementing the classroom modifications and behavioral interventions the teacher noted improvement in the classroom. She observed a decrease in inappropriate behaviors and classroom disruptions and also felt that the students were participating more in the academic work presented and were beginning to display some confidence in their abilities. She felt that the classroom took on a more positive tone.

Data collected. Upon completion of the first two SCIE observations we were unable to target items for improvement because all areas were highly rated. Ms. Long received a five in all areas except "student engagement" in which a

rating of four was received. The PC conducted a third observation with similar results.

Upon completion of the questionnaire at the end of the coaching process Ms. Long reported that the assistance she received in implementing appropriate classroom modifications was helpful. She felt the collaboration between professionals was instrumental in her achieving a higher student success rate.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the effectiveness of peer coaching by a special education consulting teacher utilizing an instrument designed to guide (a) the observation of a teacher's lesson and then (b) the debriefing and coaching of the teacher for improving instructional effectiveness.

The PC and teachers who participated in this study all felt that peer coaching using The Scale for Coaching Teacher Effectiveness (SCIE) was a beneficial process in their roles as inclusion teachers. The coaching process created numerous opportunities for collaboration among the involved teachers and this they felt was instrumental in helping them to become more successful inclusion teachers. Two of the three teachers who participated in this study

raised their SCIE scores on the targeted items, indicating improvement in their skills in those areas.

The middle school general education teachers who participated in this research study were supportive of the inclusive school movement. The three teacher participants were eager for assistance and support from the PC. They wanted specific information and suggestions to help improve their teaching effectiveness primarily with their special education and identified at-risk students. All three teachers responded positively and were very willing for the PC to participate as much as possible in their classroom activities. They provided the peer coach with their lesson plans, worksheets and tests and requested feedback from the PC with respect to their appropriateness for their special needs students. Upon completion of the study the three teachers all rated peer coaching as a favorable and positive experience and hoped that it would continue. They felt it enhanced their teaching effectiveness and welcomed the collaboration that occurred as a result of the peer coaching process.

This study employed a formal design and required time for implementation that would limit the number of teachers who could receive this assistance. Peer coaching could be implemented on a broader scale with a set of established procedures in place to guide the process. The protocol used for this

research had a cover sheet for the ratings and was then followed by six pages of descriptors. A protocol that contained the descriptors and the rating together would be more beneficial. The grouping of the items was appropriate and addressed all components of effective teaching skills. All participants in the study felt that the content of the SCIE was appropriate for its use and was also helpful to them as a means for guiding their planning and implementation of instruction.

This study was reflective of the changes now occurring in schools as increasing numbers of special education students are being served in general education classrooms. General education teachers are concerned about their teaching effectiveness with respect to their special education students and other at-risk students. They do not feel equipped to handle these students within the context of general education (Fuchs & Fuchs,1994). Peer coaching can be beneficial for these teachers as they are engaged in this change process. Special education teachers can perform as peer coaches and provide the kind of support that could assist these educators in improving their effectiveness.

Peer coaching can become a powerful tool in the education process. While proving to be a valuable tool for special education consultants, it also holds promise in mentoring first year teachers, in student teacher training programs, and also in helping to break down the walls of isolation among teachers. Given

the right tools, peer coaching can be very manageable and help improve teacher effectiveness.

As more students with special needs are placed in inclusive classes, general education teachers will be requesting assistance to help them perform their new roles. The special education teacher could provide this support by providing coaching. Peer coaching was accepted by the teachers in this study because it was guided by their desire to improve their teaching skills .

References

Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. (1994). Inclusive schools movement and the radicalization of special education reform. Exceptional Children, 60, 294-309.

Fullan, M. (1982). The meaning of educational change. Toronto: OSIE Press.

Glickman, C. (1981). Developmental supervision: Alternative practices for helping teachers improve instruction. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Glatthorn, A. (1987). Cooperative professional development: Peer centered options for teacher growth. Educational Leadership, 45, 31-35.

Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hargreaves, A. & Dawe, R. (1990). Paths of professional development: Contrived collegiality, collaborative culture, and the case of peer coaching. Teacher & Teacher Education, 6, 227-241.

Hasbrouck, J. E., (1994a). The effects of peer coaching by preservice special educators using The Scale for Coaching Instructional Effectiveness (SCIE). Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, College Station.

Hasbrouck, J. E., (1994b). The Scale for Coaching Instructional Effectiveness (SCIE). College Station, TX: Department of Educational Psychology, Texas A&M University.

Hunter, M., & Russell, D. (1989). Mastering coaching and supervision. El Segundo, CA: TIP Publications.

Idol, L. (1993). Special educator's consultation handbook. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Idol, L., Nevin, A., & Paolucci-Whitcomb, J. (1994). Collaborative consultation (2nd ed.). Rockville, MD: Aspen Systems Corp.

Liebermann, A., & Miller, L. (1984). Teachers, their world and their work. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 325-340.

Little, J. W. (1989). The mentor phenomenon and the social organization of teaching. Review of Research in Education, 5. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Miller, S. P., Harris, C., & Watanabe, A. (1991). Professional coaching:

A method for increasing effective and decreasing ineffective teacher behaviors. Teacher Education and Special Education, 14, 183-191..

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) (1990). Effective schooling practices: A research synthesis 1990 update. Portland, OR: Author.

Peterson, S. K. & Hudson, P. J. (1989). Coaching a strategy to enhance preservice teacher behaviors. Teacher Education and Special Education, 12,56-60.

Robbins, P. (1991). How to plan and implement a peer coaching program. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Rosenholtz, S. (1989). Teacher's workplace. New York: Longman.

Showers, B., Joyce, B., & Bennett, B. (1989). Synthesis of research on staff development: A framework for future study and a state-of-the-art analysis. In R. S. Brandt (Ed.), Coaching and Staff Development (pp. 120-131). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Simpson, R. L., Whelan, R. J., & Zabel, R. H. (1993). Special education personnel preparation in the 21st century: Issues and strategies. Remedial and Special Education, 14, 7-22.

Strother, D. B. (1989). Peer coaching for teachers: Opening classroom doors. Phi Delta Kappan, 70 824-827.

Suen, H. K., & Ary, D. (1989) Analyzing quantitive behavioral observation data. Hillsdale, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum.

Figure 1: Example of sample items from the three categories of the Scale for Coaching Instructional Effectiveness

A. LESSON PLANNING & ORGANIZATION

A1. Lesson Planning/Preparation

a • T. selects APPROPRIATE objective(s)/ purpose for lesson
(MATCHES FULL-RANGE of instructional needs, ages, background, skill levels; IMPORTANT)

1 (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED) 2 3 4 5 (EXCELLENT) NA Can't Judge

b • T. PREPARES & ORGANIZES materials for lesson parts.

1 (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED) 2 3 4 5 (EXCELLENT) NA Can't Judge

c • T. LOGICALLY ORGANIZES lesson CONTENT
(key ideas emphasized; consistent definitions; parts of lesson logically linked/enhance understanding).

1 (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED) 2 3 4 5 (EXCELLENT) NA Can't Judge

d • T. LOGICALLY ORGANIZES lesson PRESENTATION (sequence/order).

1 (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED) 2 3 4 5 (EXCELLENT) NA Can't Judge

B. INSTRUCTION

B1. Starting Lesson

a • T. starts lesson PROMPTLY & PURPOSEFULLY (focused on objectives/purpose).

1 (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED) 2 3 4 5 (EXCELLENT) NA Can't Judge

b • T. GAINS STUDENTS' ATTENTION before beginning.
(+ = ALL students' attention skillfully gained before starting; √ = MOST students attention gained)

1 (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED) 2 3 4 5 (EXCELLENT) NA Can't Judge

c • T. helps students UNDERSTAND PURPOSE of lesson (not always overtly stated but general reason for lesson is understood by ALL students (+) or MOST students (√)).

1 (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED) 2 3 4 5 (EXCELLENT) NA Can't Judge

d • T. "LINKS" prior knowledge, previously learned skills to current lesson.

1 (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED) 2 3 4 5 (EXCELLENT) NA Can't Judge

C. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

C1. Rules: Understood; Consistently & Fairly Applied

a • **Rules** CLEAR & REASONABLE in content & amount for students' age & skill levels.

1 (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED) 2 3 4 5 (EXCELLENT) NA Can't Judge

b • **Rules** ENHANCE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT (have a relevant, academic focus); set SAFE, POSITIVE tone).

1 (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED) 2 3 4 5 (EXCELLENT) NA Can't Judge

c • T. USES rules in teaching; REMINDS students of rules if necessary.

1 (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED) 2 3 4 5 (EXCELLENT) NA Can't Judge

d • T. ENFORCES rules APPROPRIATELY, CONSISTENTLY & FAIRLY.

1 (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED) 2 3 4 5 (EXCELLENT) NA Can't Judge

Figure 2: Design Schema

SUBJECTS	PHASE ONE	INTERIM	PHASE TWO (within 3-4 weeks of first observation
Peer Coach 3 Teachers Ms. Smith 3 months/8th grade Ms. Ryan 3 years/6th grade Ms. Long 10 years/6th grade	*Peer Coach* and *Teacher* review and discuss the *SCIE*. *Peer Coach* observes *Teacher* teaching 2 similar lessons, each of at least 40-min. duration within a 2 - 3 day time frame. *Peer Coach* completes *a SCIE* for each lesson and meets with *Teacher* within four hours of the second lesson to discuss *SCIE* results. Following the debriefing, the *Teacher* selects a goal(s) for improvement from the lowest *SCIE* scores.	*Teacher* keeps a written journal, noting all efforts & time spent toward meeting her improvement goals (observations of other teachers, workshops attended, articles read, discussions with other teachers, etc.) *Teacher* uses the *SCIE* to rate him/herself at least twice per week after teaching using a similar content and marking only those items targeted for improvement. Completed protocols are given to the *Peer Coach*.	*Peer Coach* observes *Teacher* teaching a lesson of similar content to those observed earlier and at least 40-min. duration. *Peer Coach* completes a *SCIE* for the lesson and debriefs results with the *Teacher* within four hours of the lesson . Within one week of the final debriefing the *Teacher* completes a questionnaire or interview on perceptions/opinions of her progress towards improvement goals and the utility of the *SCIE*. *Peer Coach* completes a questionnaire and/or interview on perceptions/opinions of the utility of the *SCIE* to help *Teacher* meet her goal.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SCALE FOR COACHING INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (SCIE)

(Version 11/17/93) D.A.R.C.Y. Research Group Ed. Psychology Dept. Texas A&M University

Date:____/____/____ Start Time: _____ Stop Time: _____ CODE # _____

Grade/Class:_____ Lesson Content:_____

Teacher:_____ Observer/Rater:_____

1	2	3	4	5
Improvement Needed: Major deficiency or multiple minor deficiencies.	**Improvement Desirable:** One or more minor deficiencies.	**O.K. as is:** But not a strong part of lesson.	**Good Quality:** Many positive indicators but further improvement possible.	**Excellent:** Little or no improvement possible.

NA = NOT ABLE TO OBSERVE IN THIS LESSON *? = NOT ABLE TO JUDGE QUALITY*

A. Lesson Planning & Organization

A1. Selection of Learning Objective(s)	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
A2. Expectations for Learning	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
A3. Lesson Planning/Preparation	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
A4. Quality/Match of Curriculum Materials/Media	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
A5. Accurate Content Information	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
A6. Learning Modalities	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
A7. Time Allotment	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
A8. Learning Strategies	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
A9. Appropriate Grouping & Seating	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
A10. Individual Differences Addressed	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?

B. Instruction

B1. Gaining Student Attention	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
B2. Communicating Objective(s)/Rationale	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
B3. Active Participation & Involvement	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
B4. Lesson Pacing	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
B5. Relating Prior Knowledge/Learning	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
B6. Questioning Strategies	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
B7. Monitoring/Assessing Learning	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
B8. Student Self-Monitoring of Learning	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
B9. Modeling/Demonstrating	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
B10. Guided Practice	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
B11. Independent Practice	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
B12. Error Correction	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
B13. Responsive Lesson Adjustment	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
B14. Communication	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?

C. Classroom Management

C1. Clear Rules & Procedures	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
C2. Rules Consistently & Fairly Applied	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
C3. Management Behaviors	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
C4. Positive Reinforcement *(verbal & non-verbal)*	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
C5. Motivation	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
C6. Student Engagement	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
C7. Negative Behaviors Addressed	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
C8. Student Self-Monitoring & Self-Management	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?
C9. Minimizing Transitions & Disruptions	1	2	3	4	5	NA	?

Scale for Coaching Instructional Effectiveness (SCIE)

D.A.R.C.Y. Research Group Educational Psychology Dept. Texas A&M University version 11/17/93

RATING SCALE FOR ALL ITEMS:

1	2	3	4	5
Improvement Needed: Major deficiency or multiple minor.	**Improvement Desirable**: One or more minor deficiencies.	**O.K. as is**: But not a strong part of lesson.	**Good Quality**: Many positive indicators present but further improvement possible.	**Excellent**: Little or no improvement possible.

A. Lesson Planning & Organization

A1. Selection of Lesson Objective(s)

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • Objectives or purpose of lesson CLOSELY MATCH students' instructional needs, ages, skills, abilities. • Students HAVE the background knowledge, vocabulary or preskills required to meet the objectives. • Objectives are NOT TOO BASIC or already mastered by most students. • Objective(s) are IMPORTANT, e.g., high-use, high-relevance skill or content information. • There are CLEAR ACADEMIC EXPECTATIONS/focus in the lesson.

DEFICIENCIES: • Objective(s) or purpose of lesson POORLY MATCHED to students' instructional needs, ages, skills, abilities. • Meeting objective(s) requires background knowledge, vocabulary or preskills students LACK. • Objective(s) TOO BASIC or already mastered by most of the students. • Objective(s) UNIMPORTANT, e.g., low utility skill or content information of little use or relevance. • LACK OF ACADEMIC EXPECTATION/focus.

A2. Expectations for Learning

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • High yet REALISTIC standards are established for amount and quality of work for ALL students. • Expectations for learning are CLEARLY COMMUNICATED to the students. • Students are held ACCOUNTABLE for assigned work and are expected to USE TIME PRODUCTIVELY.

DEFICIENCIES: Only LOW EXPECTATIONS for student learning and task accomplishment. • High standards are only established for SOME students. • Expectations for AMOUNT OR QUALITY of work UNREASONABLE (too high or too low). • Expectations for learning NOT CLEAR to students.

A3. Lesson Planning/Preparation

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • Materials WELL PREPARED and ORGANIZED for all lesson parts. • BACK-UP activities were planned. • Student responses are WELL ANTICIPATED. • Lesson is easy to follow and LOGICALLY ORGANIZED. • Excellent TASK ANALYSIS evident. • Presentation STAYS FOCUSED on lesson objective(s).

DEFICIENCIES: • Lesson NOT READY; teacher appears to be "winging it". • NO BACK-UP activities. • POOR ANTICIPATION of student responses. • LITTLE PREPARATION OR PLANNING evident. • Lesson hard to follow and illogical. DISORGANIZED & DISJOINTED. • Frequent digressions.

A4. Quality/Match of Curriculum Materials/Media

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • Materials/media are of GOOD QUALITY. • Materials/media MATCH learning objectives, students' ages, interests, skills and abilities. • Materials/media used ENHANCE LEARNING. • Those materials very useful or necessary for learned were USED.

DEFICIENCIES: • Materials/media are of POOR QUALITY. • Materials/media DO NOT MATCH learning objectives, students' ages, interests, skills or abilities. • Materials DO NOT ENHANCE LEARNING. • MATERIALS OMITTED which could have enhanced learning.

A5. Accurate Content Information

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • CONSISTENTLY ACCURATE content information presented. • GOOD GRASP of vocabulary and facts in the content area.

DEFICIENCIES: • MAJOR ERRORS in content information, e.g., word definitions, statements of facts, explanations of concepts, etc.

A6. Learning Modalities

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • Presentation methods and required student response modes MATCH lesson objectives. • Presentation methods and required student RESPONSE MODES APPROPRIATE to students' ages & skill levels. • An appropriate VARIETY of presentation and response modes.

DEFICIENCIES: • Presentation methods and required student response modes are INAPPROPRIATE for lesson objectives and/or students' ages & skill levels. • NO VARIETY in presentation and response modes, although desirable.

A7. Time Allotment

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • Effective planning for amount of time spent on ALL lesson parts (each lasts long enough for students to learn, yet short enough to keep up lesson momentum). • Most time spent academically-focused.

DEFICIENCIES: • POOR time ALLOTMENT to various lesson parts (some far too long or too short for effective learning). • Insufficient time allotted for ACADEMIC tasks.

A8. Learning Strategies *(Mnemonics, Graphic Organizers, Cooperative Learning, etc.)*

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • SKILLFUL use made of learning strategies. • Learning strategies are APPROPRIATE to lesson objectives, to student skills, and to student ages. • Students are WELL-PREPARED in strategy use.

DEFICIENCIES: • Learning strategies NOT USED when they would be appropriate. • Strategies USED INAPPROPRIATELY or with INADEQUATE student preparation.

A9. Appropriate Grouping & Seating

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • Grouping and seating arrangements THOUGHTFULLY ESTABLISHED and EFFECTIVELY MAINTAINED. • Arrangements benefit student LEARNING.

DEFICIENCIES: • Grouping and seating is HAPHAZARD, resulting in confusion and wasted time. • Arrangements NEGATIVELY AFFECT teaching and learning.

A10. Individual Differences Addressed

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • The FULL RANGE of skill and ability differences among students were CONSIDERED in planning and preparation. • The needs of ALL the students are addressed.

DEFICIENCIES: • Skill and ability DIFFERENCES among students are NOT CONSIDERED in planning and preparation. The needs of only SOME students are addressed. • NO PLANNED ADAPTATIONS exist for the needs of individual students.

B. Instruction

B1. Gaining Student Attention

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • EFFECTIVELY gains entire group's attention before beginning lesson or giving directions. • Students ACTIVELY LISTEN during directions.

DEFICIENCIES: • LITTLE ATTEMPT to gain student attention. • Attention gained INEFFECTIVELY so lessons/directions are not understood by all.

B2. Communicating Objective(s)/Rationale

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • Objective(s) APPROPRIATE, CLEAR, ACCURATE and WELL-STATED at the proper time, and KEPT IN FRONT of students (reminders). • Statement of objective(s) keeps lesson and student FOCUSED on target. • RATIONALE for lesson (why useful or necessary) effectively communicated to intrinsically motivate students. • Students UNDERSTAND how to show mastery of lesson objective(s).

DEFICIENCIES: • Objectives NOT CLEARLY communicated to students. • Students not told why lesson is USEFUL OR NECESSARY. Stated objective(s) DO NOT MATCH lesson content or are VAGUE/CONFUSING. How MASTERY of objective(s) to be demonstrated not MADE CLEAR to students. Little attempt to INTRINSICALLY MOTIVATE students.

B3. Active Participation & Involvement

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • All students have NUMEROUS and FREQUENT opportunities to actively participate in learning. • Chances to talk, answer questions, demonstrate, etc., EQUALLY DISTRIBUTED among students.

DEFICIENCIES: • Students have few, INFREQUENT OPPORTUNITIES to actively participate in learning. Or only a FEW students are called upon to answer questions, demonstrate, etc. Or opportunity to respond NOT EQUAL across students (some frequently involved; others little/no involvement).

B4. Lesson Pacing

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • Lesson started PROMPTLY and PURPOSEFULLY. • Lesson SMOOTH and WELL-PACED, not rushed or dragging. • Lesson pacing ensures TIME FOR REFLECTION, yet little opportunity for minds to wander. • Students' attention kept FOCUSED.

DEFICIENCIES: • Start of lesson DELAYED, SLOW, NOT PURPOSEFUL. Lesson NOT WELL PACED: too fast, too slow, or jerky & erratic. Pacing confuses students, looses their attention, REDUCES LEARNING EFFECTIVENESS.

B5. Relating Prior Knowledge/Learning

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • Excellent use made of prior knowledge and/or previously learned skills/material to "LINK" current lesson.

DEFICIENCIES: • Lesson NOT RELATED to prior knowledge or previously learned skills/ material. • Lesson is "out of the blue." • Prior knowledge LINKAGE POORLY made, wasting time and confusing students.

B6. Questioning Strategies

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • RELEVANT questions are encouraged. • SUFFICIENT TIME given for questioning. • Questions handled INFORMATIVELY, RESPECTFULLY AND EFFICIENTLY. • Questions from teacher focus on KEY ELEMENTS of the lesson. • Students encouraged to REFLECT before answering. • SUFFICIENT TIME is appropriately given to SLOWER RESPONDING students. • Students encouraged and assisted to EXPAND/ELABORATE responses when appropriate.

DEFICIENCIES: • Relevant questions DISCOURAGED or NO OPPORTUNITY for questions given. • Questions from teacher NOT DIRECTLY RELATED to lesson objectives. • Questioning method RUSHES students to a response, when more reflection is desirable. • Students NOT ENCOURAGED TO ELABORATE OR EXPAND responses, when it would be appropriate.

B7. Monitoring/Assessing Learning

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • Effective and frequent CHECKS of students' understanding during the lesson. • Students' responses carefully MONITORED and corrective FEEDBACK PROVIDED as needed. • Assessments closely MATCHED with objectives and APPROPRIATE for ages, skills, and abilities of students.

DEFICIENCIES: • LITTLE OR NO ATTEMPT made to check whether students understand/ are learning. ACCURACY of student responses is IGNORED or very ineffectively monitored. Assessment POORLY MATCHED with objectives or poorly matched with ages, skills, abilities of students.

B8. Student Self-Monitoring of Learning

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • Student PLAYS MAJOR ROLE in assessing accuracy and quality of his/her own work. • Students encouraged to REFLECT upon and judge own work and how lesson objectives are being mastered.

DEFICIENCIES: • Student NOT INVOLVED in any assessment of his/her work accuracy. Students NOT ENCOURAGED TO REFLECT on how much or how well lesson objectives are being mastered.

B9. Modeling/ Demonstrating

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE modeling, demonstrations, use of concrete examples/non-examples. • Required thinking skills/cognitive processes skillfully modeled. • WELL-TIMED, WELL-PACED, of REASONABLE duration.

DEFICIENCIES: • LITTLE OR NO modeling, demonstrations, use of concrete examples, although needed to learn new concepts or skills or correct errors. Little or no modeling provided of thinking skills or cognitive processes required to meet the objective when such modeling would be helpful. Or very INEFFECTIVE modeling/demonstrations provided (too long, too short, poorly timed or paced, poor/insufficient examples).

B10. Guided Practice

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE guided practice provided. • Well-timed, well-paced, of reasonable duration to ensure learning. • PROMPTS AND CUES to reduce errors skillfully provided.

DEFICIENCIES: • LITTLE OR NO guided practice offered, although needed to practice new concepts or skills. • Little or NO use of PROMPTS OR CUES to reduce errors, or provided poorly.

B11. Independent Practice

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • Good TIME ALLOCATION to independent practice with MATCH to students' abilities, ages and need for practice. • Students WELL-PREPARED for independent practice. • CLEAR, WELL-PRESENTED INSTRUCTIONS WITH UNDERSTANDING checked and clarified. • Students APPROPRIATELY MONITORED. • ASSISTANCE available as needed and is provided efficiently and effectively. • NON-DISRUPTIVE PROCEDURES in place and used for those who finish work early.

DEFICIENCIES: • Practice opportunities INSUFFICIENT to obtain automaticity of skills. • Skills OVER PRACTICED. • Students allowed to work independently with INADEQUATE PREPARATION/directions or supervision. • No established procedure to get help if needed. • Procedure used for obtaining help is TIME-CONSUMING OR DISRUPTIVE to learning. • NO PROCEDURE established for those who finish work early or procedures are DISRUPTIVE.

B12. Error Correction

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • Errors are noticed and corrected. • Error correction is IMMEDIATE and SUPPORTIVE. • TIME spent in correcting sufficient but as quick and efficient as possible. • Corrections consistently provided that help students UNDERSTAND why the error was made.

DEFICIENCIES: • Errors are not noticed or not corrected or correct responses treated as errors. • Error correction is too DELAYED OR NEGATIVE/PUNITIVE. • TOO MUCH or TOO LITTLE time spent in correcting errors. • Error correction does not help students understand why their errors were made.

B13. Responsive Lesson Adjustment

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • Successfully ADJUSTS/ADAPTS during lesson, based on student responses. • Selectively adapts/adjusts for INDIVIDUAL LEARNERS as needed.

DEFICIENCIES: • DOES NOT ADJUST/ADAPT lesson although needed for motivation and learning based on students' responses/errors during lesson.

B14. Communication

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • Consistently CLEAR and ACCURATE LANGUAGE used in speaking and writing—no errors in grammar or vocabulary. • Good ENUNCIATION enhances understanding. • Level of vocabulary used to present lesson APPROPRIATE for students. • Ideas and directions CLEARLY COMMUNICATED.

DEFICIENCIES: • FREQUENT ERRORS in grammar or vocabulary in teacher's spoken or written communication. • UNCLEAR directions/explanations given; TOO LONG or TOO SHORT. LEVEL of vocabulary used INAPPROPRIATE for students (too hard; too easy). Or POOR ENUNCIATION interferes with understanding.

C. Classroom Management

C1. Clear Rules & Procedures

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • Rules and procedures are REASONABLE in number; CLEAR and UNDERSTOOD. • Students REMINDED of the rules if necessary. • Emphasis and focus of rules is ACADEMIC and TASK-ORIENTED.

DEFICIENCIES: • NO EXPLICIT CLASSROOM RULES or procedures, although needed. • Rules and procedures are VAGUE/ UNCLEAR, causing confusion. • Rules are too NUMEROUS and DETAILED to be useful. • Students NOT CLEARLY REMINDED of the rules, although they need to be.

C2. Rules Consistently & Fairly Applied

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • CONSISTENT and FAIR application of rules at all times and to ALL STUDENTS.

DEFICIENCIES: • Rules are applied INCONSISTENTLY or UNFAIRLY.

C3. Management Behaviors

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • Teacher EFFECTIVELY and APPROPRIATELY uses proactive, preventative management techniques (voice tones/volume; continuous scanning of students; purposeful movement among students as they work; effective use of proximity control).

DEFICIENCIES: Little or no use of proactive, preventative management techniques.

C4. Positive Reinforcement (Verbal & Non-Verbal)

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • Frequent and appropriate POSITIVE reinforcement. • Low-level SOCIAL REINFORCERS primarily used; token reinforcement used appropriately only as necessary. • Actively and consistently works at "catching students in the ACT OF BEING GOOD." • Classroom atmosphere is POSITIVE and SAFE. • Reinforcement is NATURAL/ SPONTANEOUS and SENSITIVE/APPROPRIATE for students. • Reinforcement is EFFECTIVE—has desired effect on students.

DEFICIENCIES: • LITTLE OR NO POSITIVE reinforcement for students. • Classroom atmosphere negative/PUNITIVE. • REINFORCEMENT IS STRAINED, ARTIFICIAL, unnatural or inappropriate for students. • May over-use UNFOCUSED, general positive comments. • Reinforcement INEFFECTIVE (ignored by students or counter-productive).

C5. Motivation

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • ENTHUSIASM and INTEREST in lesson content demonstrated by the teacher. • Extra motivational TECHNIQUES USED, as necessary, to motivate students. • Motivational techniques are age and interest APPROPRIATE. • Students interest and excitement about lesson content ENCOURAGED.

DEFICIENCIES: • LITTLE OR NO ENTHUSIASM or interest in lesson content demonstrated by the teacher. • Extra motivational TECHNIQUES NOT USED, although would enhance learning. • Motivational techniques NOT MATCHED to students ages or interests. • Students' interest or excitement about lesson content ignored or NOT ENCOURAGED.

C6. Student Engagement

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • EFFICIENT, POSITIVE, CONSISTENT routines and motivational strategies for obtaining, holding and increasing students' task engagement. • Students CONSISTENTLY ENGAGED.

DEFICIENCIES: • NO EFFICIENT, POSITIVE ROUTINES for obtaining and maintaining student engagement in learning, although needed. Or routines present but used INCONSISTENTLY. • Students spend long periods OFF-TASK.

C7. Negative Behaviors Addressed

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • Off-task behavior is SMOOTHLY, EFFICIENTLY and POSITIVELY redirected to on-task focus. • Very inappropriate behavior is SMOOTHLY, EFFICIENTLY and CONSISTENTLY stopped with minimum interruption of lesson and minimum negativity.

DEFICIENCIES: • Off-task behavior is IGNORED/PERMITTED, PUNISHED, OR ENCOURAGED. • Very inappropriate behavior is ignored, permitted, or INCONSISTENTLY stopped. • Consequences administered INCONSISTENTLY or in a PUNITIVE, DEMEANING manner.

C8. Student Self-Monitoring & Self-Management

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • Students are ENCOURAGED to self-monitor and self-manage social behavior. • Students are PROVIDED SKILLS and SUPPORTS to effectively do so.

DEFICIENCIES: Students NOT INVOLVED in self-monitoring and self-management of social behavior, or are asked to self-monitor WITHOUT SUFFICIENT PREPARATION on how to do this.

C9. Minimizing Transitions & Disruptions

POSITIVE INDICATORS: • Preventative planning apparent. • Established routines to effectively handle transitions, disruptions and administrative tasks. • Minimum lesson interference. • Transitions are short.

DEFICIENCIES: • NO APPARENT ROUTINES for handling transitions, disruptions, general administrative tasks. • All take TOO MUCH INSTRUCTIONAL TIME.

Scale for Coaching Instructional Effectiveness (SCIE)

© J. Hasbrouck, 1995 D.A.R.C.Y. Research Group Educational Psychology Dept. Texas A&M version 1/10/95

Date:____/____/____ Start Time:_____ Stop Time: _____ CODE # _____

Grade/Class:_____ Lesson Content:_____

Teacher:_____ Observer/Rater:_____

KEY:
YES + = Implemented with excellent quality; high skill; occurs ALL of lesson; with ALL students.
YES √ = Implemented with good/fair quality; moderate skill; MOST of lesson; with MOST students.
NO = Not implemented *& should have been*; or implemented with low quality/ skill; small part of lesson; only FEW students.
NtOb = Not observed; not applicable; cannot judge. Not implemented but not necessary.

A. PLANNING & ORGANIZATION

A1. Lesson Planning/Preparation

		Yes	No	NtOb
a	• T. selects APPROPRIATE objective(s)/ purpose for lesson (amount & quality). (MATCHES FULL-RANGE of students' instructional needs, ages, background, developmental & skill levels; IMPORTANT/VALUABLE skill/knowledge for future learning or "real life"; REASONABLE number of objectives for students, topic and time available).	+ √		
b	• T. PREPARES & ORGANIZES materials for lesson parts.	+ √		
c	• T. selects APPROPRIATE lesson CONTENT to meet objectives/purpose of lesson. (KEY IDEAS emphasized; content ENHANCES UNDERSTANDING of objectives/lesson purpose; MATCHES FULL-RANGE of instructional needs, ages, background, developmental & skill levels).	+ √		
d	• T. LOGICALLY ORGANIZES lesson PRESENTATION (SEQUENCE/ORDER of lesson parts logically linked and enhance understanding).			

A2. Quality/Match of Curriculum Materials/Media

		Yes	No	NtOb
a	• T. uses GOOD QUALITY materials/media.			
b	• T. uses materials/media which MATCH objectives, students' ages, interests, skill levels.	+ √		
c	• T. USES materials necessary or beneficial to learning.	+ √		

B. INSTRUCTION

B1. Starting Lesson

		Yes	No	NtOb
a	• T. starts lesson PROMPTLY & PURPOSEFULLY (focused on objectives/purpose).	+ √		
b	• T. GAINS STUDENTS' ATTENTION before beginning. (+ = ALL students' attention skillfully gained before starting; √ = MOST students attention gained)	+ √		
c	• T. helps students UNDERSTAND PURPOSE of lesson [not always overtly stated but general reason for lesson is understood by ALL students (+) or MOST students (√)].	+ √		
d	• T. "LINKS" prior knowledge, previously learned skills to current lesson.	+ √		

B2. Communication

		Yes	No	NtOb
a	• T. uses ACCURATE & APPROPRIATE LANGUAGE in speaking & writing (syntax/grammar, vocabulary, handwriting & spelling).	+ √		
b	• T. uses voice at an APPROPRIATE VOLUME/TONE for communication and instruction.			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

B3. Active Learning	Yes	No	NtOb
a • T. provides students with opportunities to ACTIVELY PARTICIPATE in learning tasks (talking, answering/asking questions, performing relevant tasks; minimal sitting & listening).	+ √		
b • T. EQUALLY DISTRIBUTES opportunities to participate among students.			
c • T. keeps students FOCUSED & ENGAGED in activity; ON-TASK (+ = ALL students/ALL of lesson; √ = MOST students for MOST of lesson).	+ √		

B4. Lesson Pacing/Focus	Yes	No	NtOb
a • T. uses REASONABLE PACE (not rushed or dragging) (+ = During ALL lesson; √ = MOST of lesson).	+ √		
b • T. MAINTAINS FOCUS on objectives/purpose; stays "on track." (+ = During ALL lesson; √ = MOST of lesson).	+ √		
c • T. spends reasonable & appropriate AMOUNT OF TIME on lesson parts (long enough for students to learn; short enough to keep up momentum given students' ages, skill and developmental levels). (+ = ALL lesson parts/ √ = MOST lesson parts of reasonable length).	+ √		

B5. Giving Directions	Yes	No	NtOb
a • T. GAINS STUDENTS' ATTENTION before giving directions (+ = ALL students' attention skillfully gained; √ = MOST students' attention gained).	+ √		
b • T. MAINTAINS STUDENTS' ATTENTION while giving directions. (+ = ALL students' attention skillfully maintained; √ = MOST students' attention maintained).	+ √		
c • T. gives directions CLEARLY (appropriate difficulty/length to ages & skill levels) & COMPLETELY (essential parts of the directions given BEFORE task started).	+ √		
d • T. CHECKS FOR UNDERSTANDING before beginning task (+ = ALWAYS checks on ALL students; √ = MOST occasions checks MOST students).	+ √		

B6. Presenting New Information/Skill/Strategy	Yes	No	NtOb
a • T. MODELS or DEMONSTRATES new or unmastered skill/strategy as necessary (well-timed, well-paced, of reasonable duration to ensure learning).			
b • T. provides GUIDED PRACTICE to help students learn skill/strategy as necessary (Well-timed, well-paced, of reasonable duration to ensure learning).			
c • T. presents ACCURATE content information (e.g., word definitions, statements of facts, explanations of concepts, etc.).	+ √		
d • T. uses a VARIETY of presentation & response modes & activities (appropriate to lesson objectives and students' ages, developmental and skill levels).	+ √		

B7. Monitoring Learning/Responsive Lesson Adjustment	Yes	No	NtOb
a • T. CHECKS students' understanding during lesson (+ = ALL key parts of lesson with ALL of students; √ = MOST of lesson, MOST students).	+ √		
b • T. PROMPTLY CORRECTS or CLARIFIES errors with patience & encouragement.	+ √		
c • T. PROMPTLY and APPROPRIATELY ACKNOWLEDGES correct responses.	+ √		
d • T. encourages students to MONITOR accuracy & quality of their own work.			
e • T. ADJUSTS lesson based on student responses (provides extra practice or examples; slows or speeds pace; modifies task/lesson).	+ √		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

B8. Questioning Techniques	Yes	No	NtOb
a • T. uses questions which FOCUS on KEY ELEMENTS in lesson [appropriate to content (fact/recall or open-ended/interpretive) and to students]	+ √		
b • T. allows appropriate WAIT TIME after asking a question (varying for type of question, student ability/skill level).	+ √		
c • T. "STAYS WITH" or RETURNS TO student when initial response incorrect (prompting/probing for correct response; providing correct fact then returning later to repeat question)	+ √		

B9. Independent Practice	Yes	No	NtOb
a • T. MONITORS and PROVIDES FEEDBACK during independent practice.	+ √		
b • T. ensures ASSISTANCE available as needed & is provided.			

B10. Lesson Closure	Yes	No	NtOb
a • T. uses APPROPRIATE CLOSURE activities (SUMMARIZING/SYNTHESIZING key points; commenting on students' ACCOMPLISHMENTS; PREVIEWING upcoming learning; etc.]	+ √		
b • T. spends REASONABLE AMOUNT of TIME in closure.	+ √		
c • T. INVOLVES STUDENTS in closure activities when appropriate (given ages, skill levels, lesson subject & time available).			

C. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

C1. Rules: Understood; Consistently & Fairly Applied	Yes	No	NtOb
a • Rules are CLEAR & REASONABLE in content & amount for students' age & skill levels. ENHANCE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT (have a relevant, academic focus); set SAFE, POSITIVE tone), emphasize RESPONSIBLE BEHAVIORS for LEARNING.	+ √		
b • T. USES rules in teaching; REMINDS students of rules as necessary.	+ √		
c • T. ENFORCES rules APPROPRIATELY, CONSISTENTLY & FAIRLY.	+ √		

C2. Management Routines/Procedures	Yes	No	NtOb
a • T. uses PROACTIVE, PREVENTATIVE TECHNIQUES to minimize lesson interference (voice tones/volume; continuous scanning of students; purposeful movement among students; effective use of proximity control; non-verbal signaling; changes in pacing; removing distracters).	+ √		
b • T. has ROUTINES/PROCEDURES to MINIMIZE DISRUPTIONS TO LEARNING in place and uses them (handling student questions during work time; administrative tasks; tasks for those finishing work early, distributing/collecting papers/materials, etc.).	+ √		
c • T. ensures SHORT, SMOOTH TRANSITIONS between tasks & lessons minimizing confusion, off-task behavior & lost instructional time (students know what to do; function independently).	+ √		
d • T. PHYSICALLY ARRANGES CLASSROOM to minimize distractions & focus on learning (students facing T. & can see presented materials easily; seating allows T. to move about & monitor effectively, lower-skilled students/those with special needs given preferential seating, etc.)			

C3. Positive Reinforcement/Motivation	Yes	No	NtOb
a • T. is appropriately POSITIVE, ENCOURAGING ("catches students in the ACT OF BEING GOOD").	+ √		
b • T. shows sincere ENTHUSIASM & INTEREST in lesson content.	+ √		
c • T. uses mostly SOCIAL REINFORCERS (smiles, pats/handshakes, encouraging remarks, non-verbal signals, etc.) appropriate to age/developmental levels of students; token/tangible reinforcements (stickers, candy, etc.) used appropriately & only as necessary.	+ √		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

C4. Off-Task, Negative Behaviors Addressed		**Yes**	**No**	**NtOb**
a	• T. REDIRECTS OFF-TASK BEHAVIOR to on-task focus.	+ √		
b	• T. effectively IGNORES minor behaviors (paired with praise/appropriate attention).	+ √		
c	• T. PROMPTLY STOPS DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOR with minimum interruption of lesson.	+ √		
d	• T. administers consequences FAIRLY, CONSISTENTLY & NON-EMOTIONALLY.	+ √		

****

DEBRIEFING CHECKLIST

DATE/TIME of observation:_____ **DATE** of debriefing meeting:_____

GOAL(s) FOR IMPROVEMENT *(list targeted SCIE items by number):*

Did you as a coach...	IMPROVEMENT NEEDED	ADEQUATE	VERY GOOD	COMMENTS
1. accurately **CODE** the lesson?				
2. **USE SCIE DESCRIPTORS** to interpret results during debriefing ?				
3. help set and maintain a **POSITIVE TONE**?				
4. **ENCOURAGE** the observed **TEACHER** to **EXPRESS** ideas/opinions?				
5. equally **SHARE** talk time?				
6. use **ACTIVE LISTENING** procedures?				
7. help **LOGICALLY PRIORITIZE** a target area for setting improvement goal(s)?				
8. uncritically encourage **BRAINSTORMING** of **IDEAS** for improvement?				
9. fairly **EVALUATE** ideas for improvement and help the observed teacher make a **SELECTION**?				
10. help with **LOGISTICS** (scheduling next observation; assigning tasks, completing forms, etc.)?				

BEST COPY AVAILABLE